

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2019**

Missouri



**PART B DUE
February 1, 2021**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

560

General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

Under federal statute and regulations, each state has a responsibility to have a system of general supervision that monitors the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) by local education agencies (LEAs). The system must be accountable for enforcing the requirements of the IDEA and for ensuring continuous improvement in outcomes for students with disabilities. The general supervision system in Missouri is the responsibility of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) Office of Special Education (OSE) and is comprised of the following eight components:

1. State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)/State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
2. Policies/procedures/effective implementation
3. Integrated monitoring activities
4. Fiscal management
5. Data on process and results
6. Improvement/correction/incentives/sanctions
7. Effective dispute resolution
8. Targeted technical assistance and professional development

INTEGRATED MONITORING ACTIVITIES

DESE implements a three-year cohort cycle for monitoring all federal programs, including special education, through a tiered monitoring process in an effort to fulfill state and federal monitoring requirements for both programmatic and fiscal components. The objectives of the tiered monitoring process include:

- Monitor each LEA in a three-year cycle
- Increase the number of LEAs meeting and maintaining compliance
- Establish processes to target technical assistance and training needs

LEAs are divided into three cohorts which cycle through the monitoring activities described below. Each cohort is comprised of just under 200 LEAs.

Year One (LEA Self-Assessment and DESE desk review verification):

- Self-assessment training is provided by OSE to LEA staff regionally and through resources posted on DESE's web site
- LEAs use the Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS), a web-based general supervision management system, to conduct a self-assessment file review and submit data measuring the timely completion of initial evaluations and transition of children from Part C to Part B
- OSE staff verify the LEA-submitted data through a desk review

Year Two (Corrective Action Plan):

- OSE notifies LEAs of the results of the self-assessment and desk review verification
- LEAs submit for approval a corrective action plan (CAP) for each indicator found out of compliance through the desk review verification and implement the plan upon OSE approval
- LEAs provide documentation that demonstrates all noncompliance found for individual students has been corrected
- LEAs provide documentation that demonstrates the approved CAP was implemented and current practices are meeting compliance requirements for all indicators addressed in the CAP
- LEAs must demonstrate correction of noncompliance within one year of the date of the notification letter
- OSE conducts onsite reviews of selected LEAs based on risk assessment. Any identified noncompliance must be corrected within one year of the date of the notification letter

Year Three (Train and Maintain):

- LEAs continue to monitor their policies, practices, and special education process and provide professional development opportunities to staff to ensure fidelity of implementation of the CAP

In addition to the three-year monitoring cycle, the following are conducted on an annual basis for all LEAs:

- Review of data reported through the state's data collection systems
- Identification and review of LEAs with significant disproportionality, disproportionate representation, or significant discrepancies in discipline
- Off-cycle onsite reviews as needed

DISPUTE RESOLUTION SYSTEM (STATE COMPLAINTS, MEDIATION, AND DUE PROCESS)

Timely resolution of complaints, mediations, and due process actions is required to ensure compliant dispute resolutions. Effective collection of data enables DESE to track the issues identified to determine whether patterns or trends exist. Additionally, through tracking issues over time, it is possible

for DESE to evaluate the resolution's effectiveness and determine whether resolution was maintained in future situations. It also allows the state to identify issues which may need to be addressed through technical assistance or monitoring procedures.

IEP facilitation has been offered statewide since the 2016-17 school year. State-contracted facilitators are available to implement the facilitated IEP meeting process statewide. The OSE received technical assistance from the National Center on Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE), as a member of the IEP Facilitation Intensive Technical Assistance Workgroup #2. Three facilitators are trained as trainers in order to enable local public agency personnel to be facilitators at the local level.

MONITORING FOR VOLUNTARY COORDINATED EARLY INTERVENING SERVICES (CEIS)

CEIS are services provided to students in kindergarten through grade 12 (with a particular emphasis on students in kindergarten through grade three) who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment. An LEA may not use more than 15% of the allocated amount under Part B for any fiscal year, less any amount reduced under adjustments to local fiscal year effort (34 CFR 300.205), if any, in combination with other amounts (which may include amounts other than education funds), to develop and implement CEIS. LEAs using IDEA Part B funds for CEIS must submit expenditure and student data information to DESE through the Part B Final Expenditure Report (FER) grid, supporting data page, and CEIS Reporting Verification Form.

The CEIS information submitted is reviewed by Special Education Finance staff, in consultation with other OSE staff as needed. Through approval or disapproval of the Part B FER, Special Education Finance staff informs LEAs of review findings. If findings conclude misuse of funds, the LEA is required to return these funds.

MONITORING FOR FISCAL COMPLIANCE

DESE implements a risk-based monitoring process in an effort to fulfill state and federal monitoring requirements for fiscal components. All LEAs, regardless of cohort, go through the desk audit level of monitoring each fiscal year. For Special Education Finance, this includes review of single audit findings, budget applications, payment requests, proportionate share carryover release requests, and FERs.

The LEAs identified with medium risk complete a self-assessment questionnaire and provide documentation to support any identified areas of concern. The LEAs determined to be at highest risk for the fiscal year are selected for on-site monitoring.

These methods serve as a tool for LEAs to determine compliance with federal fiscal regulations, identify any deficiencies, and subsequently implement procedural changes to correct such deficiencies.

Technical Assistance System

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

The following describes how the state implements a comprehensive system of technical assistance (TA) to ensure that statutory requirements are understood and effectively and efficiently implemented in order to achieve improved educational outcomes for students with disabilities.

STATE COMPLIANCE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Annual training/TA is provided to LEAs for completing the self-assessment for compliance monitoring and fiscal compliance via face-to-face meetings, webinars, phone and e-mail communication, and web-based resources and Frequently Asked Questions.

REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER (RPDC) CONSULTANTS

The Department contracts with nine RPDCs across Missouri to implement improvement activities to assist the state in meeting targets specified in the SPP/APR; to improve the outcomes for students with disabilities; and to expand the state's capacity to provide timely regional services to LEAs with identified noncompliance and/or low performance for students with disabilities.

Over 100 regional consultants provide training and TA to all LEAs in Missouri:

- Special education improvement consultants align, coordinate, and deliver professional development and coaching to special and general education staff to improve performance for students with disabilities
- Schoolwide Positive Behavior Supports (SW-PBS) consultants recruit and support LEAs and buildings for SW-PBS implementation, train LEA leadership, and train and mentor LEA SW-PBS coaches/facilitators
- Compliance consultants provide training and TA to LEAs regarding IDEA compliance requirements, self-assessments, and developing/implementing corrective action plans
- Blindness skills specialists consult with LEAs in identification of and service planning for students who are blind or partially sighted
- District Continuous Improvement (DCI)/Coaching Support Team consultants assist LEAs in district-level implementation of effective educational foundation practices (collaborative data teams, common formative assessments, data-based decision making, and effective teaching practices)

PROJECT ACCESS

Project ACCESS provides autism and other pervasive developmental disorder support to LEAs and is 100% department funded. Project ACCESS designs autism specific professional development opportunities and credentials trainers through the RPDCs. Trainings are offered to LEA staff and educators working with individuals aged 0–21 who experience Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) and related disabilities. Onsite child specific consultations can be arranged through Missouri Autism Consultants (MACs) and LEA staff can be trained to be In-District Autism Consultants (IDACs). The Building Effective Autism Teams (BEAT) initiative is designed to increase local capacity for serving students with ASD.

MISSOURI SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND (MSB) OUTREACH SERVICES

MSB provides outreach services to families and LEAs across the state in the areas of visual impairment, blind, and deaf/blind which include the following: Deaf/blind technical assistance program, Library Media Center, Missouri Instructional Resource Center, Missouri Statewide Parent Involvement Network (MoSPIN), professional development, service provider listings, vision education, and Orientation & Mobility services.

MoSPIN is a program to assist Missouri families with young children who are visually impaired by providing direct, in-home parent education through specially trained "parent advisors." MoSPIN focuses on the family rather than direct services to the child.

MISSOURI SCHOOLS FOR THE SEVERELY DISABLED (MSSD) OUTREACH PROGRAM

MSSD Outreach services are designed to support LEAs serving students with moderate/severe disabilities. Assistance includes resources; staff training; LEA staff development on instructional practice, curriculum, and assessment; and student specific IEP technical assistance.

MISSOURI SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF (MSD) OUTREACH PROGRAM

The Resource Center on Deafness at MSD is Missouri's main source for programs, services, information, and resources supporting the educational

needs of deaf and hard of hearing children. The Resource Center provides a comprehensive range of programs and services to deaf and hard of hearing children, their parents, and their schools from birth until high school graduation in order to maximize educational achievement and psychosocial development. See <https://msd.dese.mo.gov/outreach-resources-center> for more information.

MISSOURI-ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY (MO-AT)

MO-AT provides a variety of assistive technology statewide services to children, families, schools, and adults. Among other services, MO-AT operates a short-term device loan program that allows LEAs to try out devices prior to purchase; reimburses schools for the purchase of high-cost assistive devices; supports an equipment exchange and recycling program; and delivers TA, consultation, and training support to LEA staff.

MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY (MSU) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The MSU Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders (CSD) Speech, Language, and Hearing Clinic provides consultative services to LEAs educating children who have cochlear implants. Consultations and trainings are designed to enhance teacher and LEA knowledge and skills to increase student achievement.

MISSOURI SCHOOLWIDE POSITIVE BEHAVIOR SUPPORTS (MO SW-PBS)

The mission of MO SW-PBS is to assist LEAs and schools in establishing and maintaining effective social behavior systems in order to improve academic and behavior outcomes for all students. The MO SW-PBS State Leadership Team develops statewide standardized training at the school, LEA, regional, and state levels. MO SW-PBS regularly collaborates and consults with the National Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and the University of Missouri (MU) PBIS Center.

MISSOURI PARENT TRAINING AND INFORMATION (PTI) CENTER

Through a contract with the OSE, the Missouri Parents Act (MPACT) provides support to families of children with disabilities throughout the special education decision-making process. Supports include providing resources and information regarding special education law and process, assisting parents to plan for school meetings, and attending IEP and other educational meetings with families. Trained volunteer mentors also support parent understanding their role in the IEP process. Mentors and staff complete a required training curriculum that assists working with families. Contractual efforts between the OSE and MPACT result in low level disagreement resolutions, training and information designed in common language, and ongoing direct parent engagement.

DISTRICT CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT (DCI)

District Continuous Improvement (DCI) is an opportunity offered to LEAs in an effort to advance and sustain effective educational practices. Using a district-level approach, the goal is to integrate effective academic and behavioral practices into a framework for achieving exceptional student outcomes. The initial cohort of districts began working in the spring of 2017.

Through this approach, DESE seeks to achieve and facilitate a multi-system of support at the LEA level to achieve exceptional outcomes for all students. This partnership between DESE and LEAs will work toward the following outcomes:

- Refinement of an integrated academic and social/behavioral framework into a cohesive DCI system of support approach that can be implemented statewide in any district, regardless of demographics
- Collection of data pointing to the non-negotiables (what works) and data pointing to elements of flexibility to implementing in various contexts
- Implementation of effective educational practices (teaching, learning, and leadership), resulting in exceptional outcomes for all students, especially students showing risk factors, including students with disabilities.

Professional Development System

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

The state implements a comprehensive system of professional development to ensure that service providers have the skills needed to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

REGIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER (RPDC) CONSULTANTS

Continuous professional development is provided for the following consultants located in the nine RPDCs: Compliance Consultants, Improvement Consultants, SW-PBS Consultants, and DCI Consultants. The professional development is provided through monthly team meetings, webinars, and/or shared learning events with OSE staff related to the described scope of work according to the contract with the department. The required meetings are designed to develop the capacity of the regional consultants to provide high quality professional development in their regions in order to assist the state in meeting the targets and indicators specified in the SPP and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). These targets and indicators are focused on improving the performance of all students, but especially students with disabilities, so they will graduate and are college and career ready.

STATE PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT GRANT (SPDG)

In October 2017, Missouri was awarded a five-year SPDG. The DCI project described above (under Technical Assistance) encompasses all elements of the previous SPDG work, but emphasis is placed on district-level implementation as opposed to building-level implementation. The LEAs are representative of all regions of the state and are demographically diverse. Currently, 147 LEAs or approximately one fourth of Missouri districts participate in the DCI.

LEAs participating in DCI are supported by coaching support teams comprised of consultants who assist in moving toward district-level implementation of the effective educational foundation practices (collaborative data teams, common formative assessments, data-based decision making, and effective teaching practices) used in the DCI work. In this model, consultants work cross-regionally to accommodate the needs of the participating LEAs.

DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS (DLM)

Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) is the state alternate assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The department has trained staff in the Office of College and Career Readiness (OCCR) Assessment Section and the OSE on the administration of the DLM Assessment, as well as the instructional support system which accompanies the assessment. These staff regularly train the RPDC Improvement Consultants on this same information so consultants can effectively train LEAs across the state. In addition, DLM staff works with and trains all RPDC Improvement Consultants annually on new information and technology available to educators. The RPDC Improvement Consultants provide training and technical assistance statewide to educators administering the DLM Alternate Assessment.

DESIRED RESULTS DEVELOPMENTAL PROFILE (DRDP) ©

The Missouri State Board of Education adopted the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP)©, a research-based, observation readiness tool, as the department's recommended early childhood instrument for use with preschool age children. Eleven regional consultants were provided training by WestEd to become credentialed Certified Coach Trainers (CCTs). These consultants provide statewide training for professionals who work with

preschool age children on use of the DRDP© instrument.

MISSOURI EARLY WARNING SIGNS

Early Warning Signs (EWS) is a data-driven decision-making process allowing educators to identify students at-risk by examining the underlying causes, match interventions to student needs, and monitor the progress of interventions. EWS examines five essential areas: adult advocates, academic support, classroom/social/behavioral issues, personalized learning environment/instructional practice, and necessary skills for graduation and post-school success. Data indicators are most predictive of a given student outcome as a “warning sign” that a student is in trouble. This system allows educators to track interventions assigned to particular students and track the associations between interventions and outcome for students.

MISSOURI POST-SECONDARY SUCCESS PROJECT

Missouri Post-Secondary Success Project is a multi-year improvement process which assists schools in embedding college and career competencies in curriculum through professional development for teams. The overall goal of this work is to support teams of high and middle school professionals to expand the college and career competencies (i.e., intrapersonal, interpersonal, and cognitive skills) of students through data-based decision making, multi-tiered instruction and interventions, and collaboration. The college and career competencies provide a unifying vernacular that supports school personnel, families, community members, and students to work together to improve post-secondary outcomes for all students. Outcomes of the project include: increased intrapersonal and interpersonal student competencies; improved academic and behavioral achievement; increased graduation rates; and improved post-school outcomes of students with and without disabilities. The implementation stages are structured to optimize successful start-up, purposeful innovation, scaling-up, and sustainability. Stages of implementation include exploration, initial implementation, full implementation, and sustainability. Full implementation and sustainability involve a collaborative effort between parents, community members, and educators to develop a culture of supporting youth with college and career competencies that lead to positive post-secondary outcomes.

Stakeholder Involvement

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed the draft SPP/APR at its December 4, 2020, meeting. To help them better understand the dynamics of the numbers, we presented the state trend data as well as comparisons across the nine designated regions of the state. The regional numbers helped the SEAP members better understand the variation that exists from one region to another. Some of the more prominent differences were between regions that are predominantly rural or urban.

No target revisions were proposed as this report uses the final set of annual targets, however baseline year changes were made for Indicators 5 and 6.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR

§300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.

PUBLIC REPORTING OF LEA DATA

The Special Education District Profiles are public reports of LEA data and are posted on the department's Missouri Comprehensive Data System (MCDS) Portal at <https://apps.dese.mo.gov/MCDS/home.aspx?categoryid=5&view=2>. Scroll to the Special Education Profiles section and select “Special Education Profile Report – Public.” Select a school year and district and click the View Report button, then use the arrows to advance through the pages of the report. An introduction to the report explains the purpose of the public reporting and the data displayed compares LEA status to each SPP target.

PUBLIC REPORTING OF STATEWIDE DATA AND STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN

The state's progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets found in the SPP are reported to the public in several ways. The State Profile is posted on the department's website at <https://dese.mo.gov/special-education/special-education-data/data-reports> (bottom section of the webpage) as well as with the District Profiles on the MCDS Portal. In most cases, data are displayed for multiple years so progress and/or slippage are evident.

The SPP/APR documents are posted on the department website at <http://dese.mo.gov/special-education/state-performance-plan>. The public are informed of the availability of these data via a Special Education Listserv which disseminates important information on special education topics to a wide range of stakeholders. These resources are also publicized at statewide conferences and training events.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2011	68.60%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	72.00%	72.50%	73.00%	73.50%	74.00%
Data	75.27%	76.56%	77.46%	76.89%	75.76%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	74.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed the draft SPP/APR at its December 4, 2020, meeting. To help them better understand the dynamics of the numbers, we presented the state trend data as well as comparisons across the nine designated regions of the state. The regional numbers helped the SEAP members better understand the variation that exists from one region to another. Some of the more prominent differences were between regions that are predominantly rural or urban.

No target revisions were proposed as this report uses the final set of annual targets, however baseline year changes were made for Indicators 5 and 6.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	5,807
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	7,573
SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	07/27/2020	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	76.68%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
5,807	7,573	75.76%	74.50%	76.68%	Met Target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

The state of Missouri has developed guidelines for graduation requirements for students in Missouri's public schools. These guidelines include policy considerations for students with disabilities served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Those guidelines include the following provisions:

- Each school district must provide a free, appropriate public education for students with disabilities until they are graduated with a regular diploma or attain the age of 21 years.
- Local school boards must establish policies and guidelines that ensure that students with disabilities have the opportunity to earn credits toward graduation in a nondiscriminatory manner within the spirit and intent of that requirement as follows:
 1. Any specific graduation requirement may be waived for a student with a disability if recommended by the student's IEP team.
 2. Students with disabilities will receive grades and have credit transcribed in the same manner as all other students when they complete the same courses as other students.
 3. Students with disabilities who complete regular courses modified as indicated in their IEPs will receive grades and have credit transcribed in the same manner as students who complete the courses without modification. The fact that the courses were modified may be noted on the transcript.
- Students with disabilities who meet state and local graduation credit requirements by taking and passing regular courses, taking and passing regular courses with modification, taking and passing modified classes, or successfully achieving IEP goals and objectives shall be graduated and receive regular high school diplomas.
- Students with disabilities who reach age twenty-one (21), or otherwise terminate their education, and who have met the district's attendance requirements but who have not completed the requirements for graduation, receive a certificate of attendance.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19 as the data reflect the 2018-19 school year.

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2006	5.70%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%	4.80%
Data	3.08%	2.36%	2.20%	2.24%	2.17%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	3.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed the draft SPP/APR at its December 4, 2020, meeting. To help them better understand the dynamics of the numbers, we presented the state trend data as well as comparisons across the nine designated regions of the state. The regional numbers helped the SEAP members better understand the variation that exists from one region to another. Some of the more prominent differences were between regions that are predominantly rural or urban.

No target revisions were proposed as this report uses the final set of annual targets, however baseline year changes were made for Indicators 5 and 6.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,818
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	412
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	46
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	750
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	32

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)

NO

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

Calculation is an annual event dropout rate = number of IEP dropouts from grades 9-12 / number of IEP students in grades 9-12

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in grades 9-12 who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of Students with IEPs in grades 9-12	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
753	39,247	2.17%	3.50%	1.92%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

Dropouts include any students who exit high school without receiving a high school diploma (receiving a certificate of attendance, reaching maximum age, dropping out). Conditions for dropping out for students with disabilities are the same as for all students.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs below.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19 as the data reflect the 2018-19 school year.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	99.30%	Actual	99.88%	99.86%	99.49%	99.54%	99.56%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	99.30%	Actual	99.89%	99.86%	99.40%	99.44%	99.50%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	95.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed the draft SPP/APR at its December 4, 2020, meeting. To help them better understand the dynamics of the numbers, we presented the state trend data as well as comparisons across the nine designated regions of the state. The regional numbers helped the SEAP members better understand the variation that exists from one region to another. Some of the more prominent differences were between regions that are predominantly rural or urban.

No target revisions were proposed as this report uses the final set of annual targets, however baseline year changes were made for Indicators 5 and 6.

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			99.56%	95.00%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			99.50%	95.00%		N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities

participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Due to COVID-19, statewide testing requirements were waived for the 2019-20 school year.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2017	Target >=	26.49%	27.00%	29.00%	18.55%	20.00%
A	Overall	18.55%	Actual	26.49%	29.17%	28.67%	18.55%	17.63%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2017	Target >=	17.32%	18.00%	20.00%	14.10%	15.00%
A	Overall	14.10%	Actual	17.32%	18.63%	18.18%	14.10%	14.14%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	20.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	15.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed the draft SPP/APR at its December 4, 2020, meeting. To help them better understand the dynamics of the numbers, we presented the state trend data as well as comparisons across the nine designated regions of the state. The regional numbers helped the SEAP members better understand the variation that exists from one region to another. Some of the more prominent differences were between regions that are predominantly rural or urban.

No target revisions were proposed as this report uses the final set of annual targets, however baseline year changes were made for Indicators 5 and 6.

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:**Reading Proficiency Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:**Math Proficiency Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			17.63%	20.00%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			14.14%	15.00%		N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Due to COVID-19, statewide testing requirements were waived for the 2019-20 school year.

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs}}{\text{# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable)}} \right] \times 100$.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	2.86%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	1.80%	1.80%	2.86%	3.00%	2.85%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	2.86%	0.00%	5.26%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	2.85%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed the draft SPP/APR at its December 4, 2020, meeting. To help them better understand the dynamics of the numbers, we presented the state trend data as well as comparisons across the nine designated regions of the state. The regional numbers helped the SEAP members better understand the variation that exists from one region to another. Some of the more prominent differences were between regions that are predominantly rural or urban.

No target revisions were proposed as this report uses the final set of annual targets, however baseline year changes were made for Indicators 5 and 6.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

487

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
2	43	5.26%	2.85%	4.65%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

For each LEA with at least ten discipline incidents (minimum cell size) for students with disabilities, the following ratio is calculated:

- Discipline Incident Rate for Students with Disabilities (number of incidents for students with disabilities / special education child count) to
- Discipline Incident Rate for Non-disabled Students (number of incidents for non-disabled students / non-disabled enrollment)

Missouri uses the same definition for "significant discrepancy" for Indicators 4A and 4B. An LEA is considered to have a significant discrepancy when the above ratio exceeds 4.0 for two consecutive years and if the average number of incidents per 100 students with disabilities is greater than 2.0 and/or the average number of incidents per 100 nondisabled students is greater than 1.0. This determination of significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, which considers a rolling two years of data, is conducted on an annual basis for every LEA in the state. Discipline incidents included in this analysis are any incidents resulting in out of school suspensions for more than ten days as well as multiple short suspensions summing to more than ten days. Multiple short suspensions are counted as a single incident for a student.

Please see additional information below which explains why the "number of districts excluded from the calculation" plus the "number of districts that met the state's minimum n-size" does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19 as the data reflect the 2018-19 school year.

The following information describes why the "number of districts excluded from the calculation" plus the "number of districts that met the state's minimum n-size" does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825, RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County, which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA Part B requirements and receive IDEA Part B dollars directly, the agencies identified and reviewed for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9 and 10 are the two "special school districts" whose data are comprised of all data from the components districts (for example, the data from the seven component districts of Pemiscot Special School District are aggregated into a single special school district). The two special school districts, along with each of the component districts, are included in the total number of LEAs included in the Introduction to the APR.

Therefore, the LEAs reported in the FFY2018 Introduction are accounted for as follows:

- 559 LEAs reported in FFY2018 Introduction which includes the two special school districts and the 29 component districts of the two special school districts
- Less 22 component districts of St. Louis County Special School District
- Less 7 component districts of Pemiscot County Special School District
- Less 43 LEAs that met the State's minimum cell size (includes the two special school districts)
- Results in 487 LEAs excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum cell size.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Data for all LEAs are reviewed annually to determine potential significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. All LEAs who meet the criteria are provided the opportunity to verify their data.

LEAs meeting criteria for significant discrepancies are subject to a review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to discipline of students with disabilities. The purpose of the reviews is to gather information to determine whether the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices related to discipline contributed to the significant discrepancy regarding discipline of students with disabilities and to determine whether the policies, procedures, and practices comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports,

and procedural safeguards. This process was modified for reviews occurring during the 2018-19 school year to assist LEAs in more accurately analyzing data and identifying possible root causes relating to the significant discrepancies. The reviews occur across a three-year monitoring cycle. The first year an LEA is identified, a self-assessment is required. The second and third consecutive years an LEA is identified, a goal progress report based on the prior self-assessment is required. If an LEA is identified another consecutive year following the third year, the monitoring cycle begins again and the LEA participates in a new self-assessment. While LEAs may review student files as a part of their self-assessment, a formal student file review will be conducted by the OSE on an as-needed basis. The OSE may determine that an onsite review is necessary at any point in the process.

The self-assessment consists of a series of questions related to policies, procedures, and practices across two topic areas - effective practices and compliance - to be answered by specific schools identified by the LEA. Based on results from the self-assessment, goals and activities are developed. The goal progress report, completed in years two and three, gives updates regarding the status of the goals and activities specified in the self-assessment.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0		0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

492

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
4	0	38	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

For each LEA with at least ten discipline incidents (minimum cell size) for students with disabilities, the following ratio is calculated:

- Discipline Incident Rate for Students with Disabilities (number of incidents for students with disabilities / special education child count) to
- Discipline Incident Rate for Non-disabled Students (number of incidents for non-disabled students / non-disabled enrollment)

Missouri uses the same definition for "significant discrepancy" for Indicators 4A and 4B. An LEA is considered to have a significant discrepancy when the above ratio exceeds 4.0 for two consecutive years and if the average number of incidents per 100 students with disabilities is greater than 2.0 and/or the average number of incidents per 100 nondisabled students is greater than 1.0. This determination of significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, which considers a rolling two years of data, is conducted on an annual basis for every LEA in the state. Discipline incidents included in this analysis are any incidents resulting in out of school suspensions for more than ten days as well as multiple short suspensions summing to more than ten days. Multiple short suspensions are counted as a single incident for a student.

Please see additional information below which explains why the "number of districts excluded from the calculation" plus the "number of districts that met the state's minimum n-size" does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19 as the data reflect the 2018-19 school year.

The following information describes why the "number of districts excluded from the calculation" plus the "number of districts that met the state's minimum n-size" does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825, RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County, which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA Part B requirements and receive IDEA Part B dollars directly, the agencies identified and reviewed for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9 and 10 are the two "special school districts" whose data are comprised of all data from the components districts (for example, the data from the seven component districts of Pemiscot Special School District are aggregated into a single special school district). The two special school districts, along with each of the component districts, are included in the total number of LEAs included in the Introduction to the APR.

Therefore, the LEAs reported in the FFY2018 Introduction are accounted for as follows:

- 559 LEAs reported in FFY2018 Introduction which includes the two special school districts and the 29 component districts of the two special school districts
- Less 22 component districts of St. Louis County Special School District
- Less 7 component districts of Pemiscot Special School District
- Less 38 LEAs that met the State's minimum cell size (includes one of the special school districts)
- Results in 492 LEAs excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum cell size (includes one of the special school districts).

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Data for all LEAs are reviewed annually to determine potential significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. All LEAs who meet the criteria are provided the opportunity to verify their data.

LEAs meeting criteria for significant discrepancies are subject to a review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to discipline of students with disabilities. The purpose of the reviews is to gather information to determine whether the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices related to discipline contributed to the significant discrepancy regarding discipline of students with disabilities and to determine whether the policies, procedures, and practices comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. This process was modified for reviews occurring during the 2018-19 school year to assist LEAs in more accurately analyzing data and identifying possible root causes relating to the significant discrepancies. The reviews occur across a three-year monitoring cycle. The first year an LEA is identified, a self-assessment is required. The second and third consecutive years an LEA is identified, a goal progress report based on the prior self-assessment is required. If an LEA is identified another consecutive year following the third year, the monitoring cycle begins again and the LEA participates in a new self-assessment. While LEAs may review student files as a part of their self-assessment, a formal student file review will be conducted by the OSE on an as-needed basis. The OSE may determine that an onsite review is necessary at any point in the process.

The self-assessment consists of a series of questions related to policies, procedures, and practices across two topic areas - effective practices and compliance - to be answered by specific schools identified by the LEA. Based on results from the self-assessment, goals and activities are developed. The goal progress report, completed in years two and three, gives updates regarding the status of the goals and activities specified in the self-assessment.

The four LEAs identified through data analysis as having significant discrepancies in discipline rates were reviewed using monitoring procedures described above. All completed the self-assessment and developed goals and activities for improvement or provided a goal progress report. In all four LEAs, policies, procedures, and practices were found to be in compliance.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0		0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2019	Target >=	56.00%	56.00%	56.00%	56.00%	56.00%
A	57.22%	Data	57.65%	57.59%	57.36%	57.04%	56.75%
B	2019	Target <=	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%	10.20%
B	8.36%	Data	8.92%	8.76%	8.58%	8.45%	8.34%
C	2019	Target <=	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	3.65%
C	3.64%	Data	3.66%	3.61%	3.63%	3.57%	3.66%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	57.22%
Target B <=	8.36%
Target C <=	3.64%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed the draft SPP/APR at its December 4, 2020, meeting. To help them better understand the dynamics of the numbers, we presented the state trend data as well as comparisons across the nine designated regions of the state. The regional numbers helped the SEAP members better understand the variation that exists from one region to another. Some of the more prominent differences were between regions that are predominantly rural or urban.

No target revisions were proposed as this report uses the final set of annual targets, however baseline year changes were made for Indicators 5 and 6.

The 2019-20 data for this indicator includes students with disabilities who are five years old in kindergarten to 21 years old instead of ages six to 21. This change aligns with federal reporting changes implemented for the 2019-20 reporting year. Due to the inclusion of five year olds in kindergarten, the state is resetting baseline to FFY 2019 (2019-20) and updated the FFY 2019 targets to match baseline. Future targets will be established in the SPP/APR due February 2022.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	120,032

Source	Date	Description	Data
Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)			
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	68,688
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	10,033
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	3,618
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	4
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	747

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	68,688	120,032	56.75%	57.22%	57.22%	Met Target	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	10,033	120,032	8.34%	8.36%	8.36%	Met Target	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	4,369	120,032	3.66%	3.64%	3.64%	Met Target	N/A

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19. The data are as of December 1, 2019, which was prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The 2019-20 data for this indicator includes students with disabilities who are five years old in kindergarten to 21 years old instead of ages six to 21. This change aligns with federal reporting changes implemented for the 2019-20 reporting year.

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2019	Target >=	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%	33.00%	47.30%
A	27.13%	Data	45.14%	44.19%	43.53%	43.62%	43.89%
B	2019	Target <=	31.00%	30.00%	29.00%	28.00%	22.80%
B	37.48%	Data	24.15%	25.02%	24.57%	24.96%	26.05%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	27.13%
Target B <=	37.48%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed the draft SPP/APR at its December 4, 2020, meeting. To help them better understand the dynamics of the numbers, we presented the state trend data as well as comparisons across the nine designated regions of the state. The regional numbers helped the SEAP members better understand the variation that exists from one region to another. Some of the more prominent differences were between regions that are predominantly rural or urban.

No target revisions were proposed as this report uses the final set of annual targets, however baseline year changes were made for Indicators 5 and 6.

The 2019-20 data for this indicator includes students with disabilities ages three through five year olds not in kindergarten instead of ages three through five inclusive. This change aligns with federal reporting changes implemented for the 2019-20 reporting year. Due to the exclusion of five year olds in kindergarten, the state is resetting baseline to FFY 2019 (2019-20) and updated the FFY 2019 targets to match baseline. Future targets will be established in the SPP/APR due February 2022.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	12,606

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,420
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	4,535
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b2. Number of children attending separate school	189
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	1

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,420	12,606	43.89%	27.13%	27.13%	Met Target	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,725	12,606	26.05%	37.48%	37.48%	Met Target	N/A

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19. The data are as of December 1, 2019, which was prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The 2019-20 data for this indicator includes students with disabilities ages three through five year olds not in kindergarten instead of ages three through five inclusive. This change aligns with federal reporting changes implemented for the 2019-20 reporting year.

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by ((# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by ((the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A1	2013	Target >=	92.70%	92.70%	92.70%	92.70%	93.90%
A1	93.83%	Data	94.76%	94.98%	95.80%	95.69%	95.88%
A2	2013	Target >=	45.00%	45.00%	45.00%	45.00%	48.20%

A2	48.10%	Data	45.97%	47.16%	44.84%	42.16%	42.17%
B1	2013	Target >=	93.80%	93.80%	93.80%	93.80%	95.50%
B1	95.48%	Data	95.80%	96.35%	96.95%	96.16%	96.85%
B2	2013	Target >=	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%	37.00%	40.60%
B2	40.51%	Data	37.97%	38.89%	38.71%	37.00%	36.39%
C1	2013	Target >=	90.70%	90.70%	90.70%	90.70%	93.50%
C1	93.48%	Data	93.61%	95.23%	95.42%	95.51%	95.96%
C2	2013	Target >=	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	56.90%
C2	56.79%	Data	54.19%	56.86%	54.28%	52.17%	51.50%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A1 >=	93.90%
Target A2 >=	48.20%
Target B1 >=	95.50%
Target B2 >=	40.60%
Target C1 >=	93.50%
Target C2 >=	56.90%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed the draft SPP/APR at its December 4, 2020, meeting. To help them better understand the dynamics of the numbers, we presented the state trend data as well as comparisons across the nine designated regions of the state. The regional numbers helped the SEAP members better understand the variation that exists from one region to another. Some of the more prominent differences were between regions that are predominantly rural or urban.

No target revisions were proposed as this report uses the final set of annual targets, however baseline year changes were made for Indicators 5 and 6.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

5,736

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	86	1.50%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	127	2.21%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3,427	59.75%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,507	26.27%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	589	10.27%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age	4,934	5,147	95.88%	93.90%	95.86%	Met Target	No Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,096	5,736	42.17%	48.20%	36.54%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	86	1.50%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	99	1.73%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3,646	63.56%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,656	28.87%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	249	4.34%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	5,302	5,487	96.85%	95.50%	96.63%	Met Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,905	5,736	36.39%	40.60%	33.21%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	87	1.52%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	105	1.83%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,888	50.35%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,963	34.22%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	693	12.08%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age	4,851	5,043	95.96%	93.50%	96.19%	Met Target	No Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,656	5,736	51.50%	56.90%	46.30%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	For Indicator A2, the state had a decrease of 5.63% from 2018-19 to 2019-20 and did not meet the 2019-20 target. This decrease was a continuation of a downward trend in Summary Statement 2 for the past several years. Decreases in the summary statement were seen across almost all of the nine regions of the state and is likely the result of better data quality - meaning that children's exit ratings more accurately reflect their functioning levels as compared to typically developing peers. As evidenced by the large percent of children who substantially increased their rate of growth (95.86% for Summary Statement A1), the LEAs are indicating that while substantial progress is seen, the children are not functioning within age expectations at time of exit. This is supported by the fact that approximately 80% of children in ECSE continue to qualify for special education services in kindergarten.
B2	For Indicator B2, the state had a decrease of 3.18% from 2018-19 to 2019-20 and did not meet the 2019-20 target. This decrease was a continuation of a downward trend in Summary Statement 2 for the past several years. Decreases in the summary statement were seen across almost all of the nine regions of the state and is likely the result of better data quality - meaning that children's exit ratings more accurately reflect their functioning levels as compared to typically developing peers. As evidenced by the large percent of children who substantially increased their rate of growth (96.63% for Summary Statement A1), the LEAs are indicating that while substantial progress is seen, the children are not functioning within age expectations at time of exit. This is supported by the fact that approximately 80% of children in ECSE continue to qualify for special education services in kindergarten.
C2	For Indicator C2, the state had a decrease of 5.20% from 2018-19 to 2019-20 and did not meet the 2019-20 target. This decrease was a continuation of a downward trend in Summary Statement 2 for the past several years. Decreases in the summary statement were seen across almost all of the nine regions of the state and is likely the result of better data quality - meaning that children's exit ratings more accurately reflect their functioning levels as compared to typically developing peers. As evidenced by the large percent of children who substantially increased their rate of growth (96.19% for Summary Statement A1), the LEAs are indicating that while substantial progress is seen, the children are not functioning within age expectations at time of exit. This is supported by the fact that approximately 80% of children in ECSE continue to qualify for special education services in kindergarten.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

NO

If no, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

Based on the ratings determined at entry and exit by the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) personnel, "comparable to same-aged peers" is defined as a rating of "5" on a scale of 1–5, meaning "completely (all of the time/typical)" in response to the question "To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations?" A rating of "5" roughly translates to a 0–10% delay.

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

ECSE personnel use multiple sources of information rather than a single approved assessment instrument to gather data for this indicator. Therefore, an approved list of instruments has not been compiled. However, the state of Missouri conducted a pilot of several early childhood assessment instruments with the intent of arriving at a more uniform assessment profile across the state for all students, including students with disabilities. In June 2013, the State Board of Education adopted the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) as the recommended instrument to be used as an Early Childhood Readiness Assessment Tool for all early childhood programs in the state. During the 2013-14 school year, training began for ECSE staff in the administration of this assessment. Some ECSE programs began voluntary usage of the assessment as the Early Childhood Outcomes data collection tool during the 2014-15 school year. The DRDP continues to be the recommended Early Childhood Readiness Assessment Tool, but the number of LEAs using this instrument is unknown.

Regardless of the instruments used, the Decision Tree for Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Rating Discussion and the Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) are available to assist ECSE personnel in synthesizing information into a comprehensive summary. The Decision Tree is a technical assistance document that assists ECSE personnel in reviewing the assessment results and determining an appropriate ECO rating. The MOSS is used to provide standard documentation statewide for reporting to the Department. The Decision Tree is located online at

<https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/se-eco-decision-tree.pdf>, and the MOSS is located at <https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/MissouriOutcomesSummarySheetREV1109.pdf>.

No sampling is used for gathering ECO data. All children with potential of being in the program for six months or more are assessed. Entry and exit data must be determined within 30 days of eligibility determination and exit from the program, respectively. A rating of 1–5 is determined for each of the three outcome indicators with 1 meaning “Not Yet” and 5 meaning “Completely.” All entry and exit data collected during a given year is submitted electronically to the department at the end of that school year. The outcome status for each child is determined by comparing the entry and exit ratings.

More information can be obtained at <https://dese.mo.gov/special-education/special-education-data/early-childhood-outcomes-eco-training>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19. In April 2020, LEAs were informed of the expectation to submit ECO data unless they had no way to gather accurate information for a child. Overall numbers of children with ECO data for 2019-20 were comparable to prior years.

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed the draft SPP/APR at its December 4, 2020, meeting. To help them better understand the dynamics of the numbers, we presented the state trend data as well as comparisons across the nine designated regions of the state. The regional numbers helped the SEAP members better understand the variation that exists from one region to another. Some of the more prominent differences were between regions that are predominantly rural or urban.

No target revisions were proposed as this report uses the final set of annual targets, however baseline year changes were made for Indicators 5 and 6.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2006	69.40%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%
Data	73.57%	75.65%	72.71%	74.41%	75.62%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	70.00%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
4,070	5,315	75.62%	70.00%	76.58%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

49,576

Percentage of respondent parents

10.72%

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

The Department uses a single survey for all students with disabilities. LEAs are instructed to disseminate the survey to parents of all students with disabilities, including preschool students.

Data reported above includes responses from both school age and preschool parent respondents. Approximately 13.8% of the respondents were parents of preschoolers.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	YES

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

The 2020 Parent Survey was comprised of ten main statements with responses on a five-point Likert scale, from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The survey was conducted and data collected by the Institute of Public Policy at the University of Missouri. The survey was sent to the 190 LEAs (cohort) that were conducting self-assessments for monitoring purposes.

Each cohort includes approximately one-third of the LEAs in the state (including public charter schools and other public agencies responsible for provision of educational services). LEAs in each cohort were selected based on size within each region and across the state. This assures an equal distribution of the LEAs in each of the cohorts. Each cohort has equal representation of large, medium, and small LEAs from urban, suburban, and rural settings. Each cohort also represents the variety of socio-economic and racial/ethnic populations found in the state.

The monitoring cohort surveyed during the 2019-20 school year included 190 LEAs. Responses were received from 176 LEAs (93% LEA response rate), which represented over 98% of the students with disabilities in the cohort's LEAs. A total of 5,390 surveys were completed, 35% by mail and 65% electronically. The return rate for 2019-20 was 10.9% which was a decrease of 2.7% from the prior year. The mean LEA response rate was 19%; the median LEA response rate was 15%. Of the 14 LEAs that did not have any survey responses, all but five had fewer than 40 students with disabilities. Note that while 5,390 surveys were completed, 5,315 responded to the items used for Indicator 8, resulting in the 10.72% return rate calculated by the system.

In order to determine representativeness of the data, respondents' geographic location was examined via Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) areas. The response rates were similar across regions, with a smaller than expected percent of responses from the St. Louis region. This is due to several larger LEAs that had low response rates.

"Age of student" was also examined via the school types of Preschool, Elementary, and Secondary. The data indicated that responses by school type (proxy for age of student) are representative of the state since the percent of responses was within 10% of the percent of child count for each school type.

Data analysis also indicates that the respondents are racially/ethnically representative of students with disabilities in the state. A comparison across all LEAs, the LEAs in the monitoring cohort surveyed in the 2019-20 school year, and the LEAs in the monitoring cohort with survey responses showed similar demographics, with differences in the white and Black populations of around 5%. The LEAs with survey responses had a slightly higher percentage of white students and a slightly lower percentage of Black students than statewide.

In summary, the review of data by geographic location, age of student, and race/ethnicity indicates that the children of respondents are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. We do recognize that the higher the response rate, the better the data. Therefore, in addition to our current practices, we plan to conduct additional follow-up with LEAs that have lower response rates in order to increase overall return rates for the survey.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

While the FFY 2019 survey results are in line with prior years, the response rate was lower than usual. The state maintained the same level of follow-up with LEAs that had low response rates as would have occurred in prior years; however the follow-up did not have the same impact to increase the number of completed surveys as in past years because LEAs and parents were occupied with more pressing issues related to COVID-19. Since survey

results statewide and by region were in line with prior years, the lower response rate does not appear to have impacted the reliability or validity of the data.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

401

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	130	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The state's identification method for disproportionate representation uses a rolling two-year approach and examines risk ratios and cell sizes for all racial/ethnic groups. For the special education total and by disability category (using state-reported Section 618 data), risk ratios are computed for every racial/ethnic group. The definition of disproportionate representation is a risk ratio greater than 2.5 for two consecutive years, along with a minimum cell size of 20 students with disabilities in the racial/ethnic group being considered as well as in the comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups) for each of the two years. Unique LEA characteristics are also considered so that LEAs are not identified as having disproportionate representation if the data are solely due to group homes or treatment centers where students are publicly placed in the LEA boundaries or other similar situations.

Please see additional information below which explains why the “number of districts excluded from the calculation” plus the “number of districts that met the state's minimum n-size” does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

When an LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation, the OSE reviews the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices for identification to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. The process for this review was modified for reviews occurring during the 2018-19 school year to assist LEAs in more accurately analyzing data and identifying possible root causes relating to the disproportionate representation. The reviews occur across a three-year monitoring cycle. The first year an LEA is identified, a self-assessment is required. The second and third consecutive years an LEA is identified, a goal progress report based on the prior self-assessment is required. If an LEA is identified another consecutive year following the third year, the monitoring cycle begins again, and the LEA participates in a new self-assessment. While LEAs may review student files as a part of their self-assessment, a formal student file review will be conducted by the OSE on an as-needed basis. In addition, the OSE may determine that an onsite review is necessary at any point in the process.

The self-assessment consists of a series of questions related to policies, procedures, and practices across two topic areas - effective practices and compliance - to be answered by specific schools identified by the LEA. Based on the results of the self-assessment, goals and activities are developed. The goal progress report, completed in years two and three, gives updates regarding the status of the goals and activities specified in the self-assessment.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19. The data are as of December 1, 2019, which was prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The following information describes why the “number of districts excluded from the calculation” plus the “number of districts that met the state's minimum n-size” does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825, RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County, which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA Part B requirements and receive IDEA Part B dollars directly, the agencies identified and reviewed for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9 and 10 are the two “special school districts” whose data are comprised of all data from the components districts (for example, the data from the seven component districts of Pemiscot Special School District are aggregated into a single special school district). The two special school districts, along with each of the component districts, are included in the total number of LEAs included in the Introduction to the APR.

Therefore, the LEAs reported in the FFY2019 Introduction are accounted for as follows:

- 560 LEAs reported in FFY2019 Introduction which includes the two special school districts and the 29 component districts of the two special school districts
- Less 22 component districts of St. Louis County Special School District
- Less 7 component districts of Pemiscot Special School District
- Less 130 LEAs that met the State's minimum cell size (includes the two special school districts)
- Results in 401 LEAs excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum cell size.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0		0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2019, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.19%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

471

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
4	0	60	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The state’s identification method for disproportionate representation uses a rolling two-year approach and examines risk ratios and cell sizes for all racial/ethnic groups. For the special education total and by disability category (using state-reported Section 618 data), risk ratios are computed for every racial/ethnic group. The definition of disproportionate representation is a risk ratio greater than 2.5 for two consecutive years, along with a minimum cell size of 20 students with disabilities in the racial/ethnic group being considered as well as in the comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups) for each of the two years. Unique LEA characteristics are also considered so that LEAs are not identified as having disproportionate representation if the data are solely due to group homes or treatment centers where students are publicly placed in the LEA boundaries or other similar situations.

Please see additional information below which explains why the “number of districts excluded from the calculation” plus the “number of districts that met the state’s minimum n-size” does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

When an LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation, the OSE reviews the LEA’s policies, procedures, and practices for identification to determine if the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. The process for this review was modified for reviews occurring during the 2018-19 school year to assist LEAs in more accurately analyzing data and identifying possible root causes relating to the disproportionate representation. The reviews occur across a three-year monitoring cycle. The first year an LEA is identified, a self-assessment is required. The second and third consecutive years an LEA is identified, a goal progress report based on the prior self-assessment is required. If an LEA is identified another consecutive year following the third year, the monitoring cycle begins again, and the LEA participates in a new self-assessment. While LEAs may review student files as a part of their self-assessment, a formal student file review will be conducted by the OSE on an as-needed basis. In addition, the OSE may determine that an onsite review is necessary at any point in the process.

The self-assessment consists of a series of questions related to policies, procedures, and practices across two topic areas - effective practices and compliance - to be answered by specific schools identified by the LEA. Based on the results of the self-assessment, goals and activities are developed. The goal progress report, completed in years two and three, gives updates regarding the status of the goals and activities specified in the self-assessment.

The four LEAs identified through data analysis as having disproportionate representation were reviewed using monitoring procedures described above. All completed the self-assessment and developed goals and activities for improvement, or provided a goal/progress report. In all four LEAs, policies, procedures and practices were found not to result in inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19. The data are as of December 1, 2019, which was prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The following information describes why the “number of districts excluded from the calculation” plus the “number of districts that met the state’s minimum n-size” does not equal the total number of districts in the state.

One of the service delivery options available under state statute is the creation of a special school district pursuant to Section 162.825, RSMo. The referendum of establishing a special school district creates a distinct public school district for the purpose of providing special education and related services to students with disabilities within the component districts of which it is comprised. Special School District of St. Louis County, which serves 22 component districts and Special School District of Pemiscot County, which serves seven component districts, are two such agencies in Missouri. As these special school districts have immediate responsibility for both policy development and implementation of federal IDEA Part B requirements and receive IDEA Part B dollars directly, the agencies identified and reviewed for SPP Indicators 4AB, 9 and 10 are the two “special school districts” whose data are comprised of all data from the components districts (for example, the data from the seven component districts of Pemiscot Special School District are aggregated into a single special school district). The two special school districts, along with each of the component districts, are included in the total number of LEAs included in the Introduction to the APR.

Therefore, the LEAs reported in the FFY2019 Introduction are accounted for as follows:

- 560 LEAs reported in FFY2019 Introduction which includes the two special school districts the 29 component districts of the two special school districts
- Less 22 component districts of St. Louis County Special School District
- Less 7 component districts of Pemiscot Special School District

- Less 60 LEAs that met the State's minimum cell size (includes the two special school districts)
- Results in 471 LEAs excluded from calculations due to not meeting minimum cell size.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0		0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	94.70%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.97%	98.81%	99.46%	99.09%	99.01%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
6,274	6,222	99.01%	100%	99.17%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

52

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Delays for the 52 children ranged from three days to 119 days. The longest delays were due in part to excessive numbers of snow days, school breaks, and the inability to contact parents. These reasons all resulted in the child being unavailable for testing and therefore, were considered acceptable extensions to the timelines, however the reasons did not fully explain the total delay and the LEAs were cited for noncompliance with the timelines. A small number of delays were due to delays in completion of evaluations. Some delays were also due to parent requests for scheduling or rescheduling of meetings. Only one of the unacceptable delays was, in part, attributed to school closure due to COVID-19.

In general, the unacceptable delays were due to evaluation/testing information not being completed or returned in a timely fashion. Most timelines deemed unacceptable included valid extensions that did not cover the entire amount of delay (i.e., delay was ten days, but only six of those days had acceptable reasons); delayed evaluation reports; parents cancelling or rescheduling of eligibility meetings; or lack of specific information from the districts as to the length of school breaks.

School closures due to COVID-19 increased the number of acceptable extensions toward the end of the 2019-20 school year. Despite statewide physical school closures and local stay at home orders, LEAs were still expected to provide educational services to all students and to continue with evaluations. LEAs were reminded that timelines could be extended because a child was not available for testing, but not simply because instruction was occurring via remote/virtual means. LEAs needed to document good faith efforts to work with parents to complete assessments if the student was not sick or quarantined.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

The state uses a 60-day timeline for initial evaluations but allows the following as reasons for extending the evaluation timelines:

- Snow days or other school closures due to inclement weather (per state regulation)
- Agency vacation days (per state regulation)
- Child's absence because of illness (per state regulation)
- Summer break (per state regulation)
- Parent refuses/fails to produce child (per 300.301(d))
- Change in district of enrollment during evaluation process (per 300.301(d))

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data for this indicator are gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) which is used by LEAs to enter monitoring self-assessment information, including a list of children for whom an initial evaluation was conducted. The special education monitoring cycle is part of a three-year cohort process, and approximately one-third of all LEAs are reviewed each year. Each of the three cohorts is representative of the state and includes LEAs in all regions of the state.

LEAs enter the following information for each student referred for initial evaluation during the reporting period:

- Student's name
- Date of parental consent to evaluate
- Date of eligibility
- Student eligible (Y/N)
- Eligibility determined in 60 days (calculated Y/N)
- If No, reason for delay
- Acceptable reason (Y/N)

The information is reviewed and verified by OSE Compliance staff during the desk review of the self-assessment data. The desk review process includes checking the 60-day evaluation timeline information by using a calendar system. If the LEAs include initial evaluation timelines which are not within 60 days, the criteria listed above are accepted as reasons for extending the evaluation timelines. Delays are considered out of compliance if the reasons for the extensions do not meet the established acceptable criteria or if the LEA fails to provide a reason for the extension of the timeline.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
60	60	0	0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

Timeline data are submitted by the LEAs in the monitoring cohort to the SEA in May each year. As described above, the data includes pertinent dates and explanations for exceeding timelines if necessary, but the data are not considered noncompliant until verification by OSE staff has been completed. Between May and August, OSE compliance staff request any necessary documentation from the LEAs in order to verify whether delays are due to acceptable reasons.

Final reports, which include noncompliance due to timelines and any other student file review findings, are issued to LEAs in September, within one month after finalizing the SEA's verification of LEA calls. In summary, the findings issued in September are based on data from the immediately

preceding school year. Therefore, the correction of noncompliance “identified” in FFY18 is based on data from FFY17 which was reported in the second prior APR.

In FFY2018, there were 60 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 25 LEAs. The state’s follow-up procedures require LEA submission of a second set of timeline data for children with initial evaluations. The state verified through this follow-up that all 25 LEAs demonstrated no further noncompliance within the OSEP required timeline of 12 months and were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

In FFY2018, there were 60 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 25 LEAs. The state’s follow-up procedures require LEA submission of documentation that each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected. The state verified through this follow-up that all 25 LEAs with noncompliance had corrected all 60 findings of individual child noncompliance within 12 months and: (1) were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	95.40%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.45%	97.51%	98.54%	98.33%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	733
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	124

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	447
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	3
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	4
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	155

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	447	447	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f
0

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Attach PDF table (optional)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data for this indicator are gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) which is used by LEAs to enter monitoring self-assessment information, including a list of children served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination. The special education monitoring cycle is part of a three-year cohort process, and approximately one-third of all LEAs are reviewed each year. Each of the three cohorts is representative of the state and includes LEAs in all regions of the state.

LEAs enter the following information for each child referred from Part C during the reporting period:

- Child's name
- Date of birth
- Date of referral to ECSE
- Date of referral to First Steps (Part C)
- Parental Consent Received (Y/N)
- Date of eligibility
- Student eligible? (Y/N)
- Date of IEP
- IEP in place by third birthday (calculated Y/N)
- If No, reason for delay
- Acceptable reason (Y/N)

The information is reviewed and verified by DESE compliance staff as a part of the desk review of the self-assessment data. The only acceptable reasons for exceeding the timeline are failure of parent to provide consent to evaluate in a timely manner or failure of the parent to make the child available for evaluation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	0	0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Timeline data are submitted by the LEAs in the monitoring cohort to the SEA in May each year. As described above, the data includes pertinent dates and explanations for exceeding timelines, if necessary, but the data are not considered noncompliant until verification by OSE staff has been completed. Between May and August, OSE compliance staff request any necessary documentation from the LEAs in order to verify whether delays are due to acceptable reasons.

Final reports, which include noncompliance due to timelines and any other student file review findings, are issued to LEAs in September, within one

month after finalizing the SEA's verification of LEA calls. In summary, the findings issued in September are based on data from the immediately preceding school year. Therefore, the correction of noncompliance "identified" in FFY18 is based on data from FFY17 which was reported in the second prior APR.

In FFY 2018, there were five individual child level findings of noncompliance in five LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of a second set of timeline data for children who transitioned from Part C to Part B. The state verified through this follow-up that all five LEAs demonstrated no further noncompliance within the OSEP required timeline of 12 months and were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

In FFY 2018, there were five individual child level findings of noncompliance in five LEAs. The state's follow-up procedures require LEA submission of documentation that each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected. The state verified through this follow-up that all five LEAs with noncompliance had corrected all five findings of individual child noncompliance within 12 months and: (1) were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Secondary transition: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	91.30%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	88.58%	88.29%	87.67%	94.42%	93.62%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
645	723	93.62%	100%	89.21%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Special education monitoring is conducted on a three-year cycle, meaning that the same cohort of LEAs is monitored once every three years. The cohort of LEAs monitored in FFY16 and FFY19 had compliance results of 87.67% and 89.21%, respectively. This indicates that while there was slippage from the results of the cohort monitored in FFY18, within the FFY19 cohort there was a small increase in the compliance results. That said, the small increase is not good enough.

As described in the data collection methodology below, there are eight compliance indicators that must all be met in order to count a student as “in compliance” with the Indicator 13 requirements. Individually, the eight indicators had very high compliance rates ranging from 97.8% to 99.5%. Over 60% of the students with noncompliance had only one of the eight indicators out of compliance. This suggests that the vast majority of requirements are met and that noncompliance is scattered across the eight indicators. This “scattering” of noncompliance poses challenges for targeting technical assistance to LEAs, however the OSE compliance staff and consultants continue to provide a variety of technical assistance and professional development to LEAs throughout the monitoring cycle (see Introduction for more detail).

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data for this indicator are gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) which is used by LEAs to enter self-assessment information. Approximately one-third of all LEAs are reviewed each year for special education monitoring purposes.

LEAs complete a file review on transition age students and address the following statements for each student:

- 200.800.a: A measurable postsecondary goal (or goals) that covers education or training, employment, and, as needed, independent living.
- 200.800.b: Annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable the child to meet the postsecondary goal(s).
- 200.800.c: Transition services in the IEP that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school.
- 200.800.d: If appropriate, there is evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP team meeting with the proper consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.
- 200.800.e: The measurable postsecondary goals are based on age-appropriate transition assessment.
- 200.800.f: The transition services include courses of study that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school.
- 200.800.g: The transition services were developed considering the individual child’s needs, preferences, and interests.
- 200.800.i: There is evidence the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services were discussed.

OSE Compliance staff request documentation from LEAs to review and verify LEA calls based on the above standards. LEAs identified with noncompliance are required to address individual student noncompliance and complete corrective action plans that ensure correction of noncompliance within 12 months. Documentation of correction is submitted for review and verification.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
34	34	0	0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

As described in the introduction, LEAs in the monitoring cohort conduct a self-assessment, including student file reviews, throughout the school year and submit the results to the OSE in the spring. Data submitted by the LEAs are not considered noncompliant until verification by OSE staff has been completed. Throughout late spring and summer, OSE compliance staff request any necessary documentation from the LEAs in order to verify LEA compliance calls.

Final reports, which include noncompliance due to timelines and any other student file review findings, are issued to LEAs in September, within one month after finalizing the SEA’s verification of LEA data. In summary, the findings issued in September are based on data from the immediately preceding school year. Therefore, the correction of noncompliance “identified” in FFY18 is based on data from FFY17 which was reported in the second prior APR.

In FFY 2018, there were 34 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 26 LEAs. The state’s follow-up procedures require LEA submission of a second set of IEP secondary transition plan data. The state verified through this follow-up that all 26 LEAs demonstrated no further noncompliance within the OSEP required timeline of 12 months and were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

In FFY 2018, there were 34 individual child level findings of noncompliance in 26 LEAs. The state’s follow-up procedures require LEA submission of documentation that each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected. The state verified through this follow-up that all 26 LEAs with noncompliance had corrected all 34 findings of individual child noncompliance within 12 months and: (1) were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) had corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Post-school outcomes: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under "competitive employment" in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of "leavers" who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

"Leavers" should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, "leavers" who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, "leavers" who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2009	Target ≥	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%	24.40%
A	23.38%	Data	31.03%	29.55%	28.50%	25.52%	25.21%
B	2009	Target ≥	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%	46.90%
B	45.94%	Data	59.49%	60.89%	59.67%	58.25%	57.93%
C	2009	Target ≥	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%	51.30%
C	50.33%	Data	64.79%	65.90%	64.29%	62.90%	62.63%

FFY 2019 Targets

FFY	2019
Target A ≥	24.40%
Target B ≥	46.90%
Target C ≥	51.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed the draft SPP/APR at its December 4, 2020, meeting. To help them better understand the dynamics of the numbers, we presented the state trend data as well as comparisons across the nine designated regions of the state. The regional numbers helped the SEAP members better understand the variation that exists from one region to another. Some of the more prominent differences were between regions that are predominantly rural or urban.

No target revisions were proposed as this report uses the final set of annual targets, however baseline year changes were made for Indicators 5 and 6.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	7,228
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,778
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2,367
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	197
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	110

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1,778	7,228	25.21%	24.40%	24.60%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	4,145	7,228	57.93%	46.90%	57.35%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	4,452	7,228	62.63%	51.30%	61.59%	Met Target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	NO

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Missouri differs from most, if not all, states in that the state receives follow-up status on the entire population of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had an IEP in effect at the time they left school.

LEAs are responsible for conducting the follow-up on former students and for reporting the data to the state. The state data collection mechanism requires that all LEAs report a follow-up status for each applicable youth. If an LEA is not able to locate former students in order to ascertain their status, the follow-up status reported is "unknown." "Unknown" responses are included in the number of respondent youth (denominator of the calculations) but not in sections A, B, or C.

Therefore, since the state uses this census data collection requiring that a follow-up status be reported by LEAs for all applicable youth, the data included in this APR are 100% representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Question	Yes / No
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	YES

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	41
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	17

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed the draft SPP/APR at its December 4, 2020, meeting. To help them better understand the dynamics of the numbers, we presented the state trend data as well as comparisons across the nine designated regions of the state. The regional numbers helped the SEAP members better understand the variation that exists from one region to another. Some of the more prominent differences were between regions that are predominantly rural or urban.

No target revisions were proposed as this report uses the final set of annual targets, however baseline year changes were made for Indicators 5 and 6.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	46.90%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%
Data	44.44%	52.94%	58.97%	21.74%	60.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	35.30%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
17	41	60.00%	35.30%	41.46%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19.

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(ii))$ divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 Mediations held	12
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	4
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	6

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Missouri, the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) serves dual roles as an advisory group to the OSE and as the primary stakeholder group for Part B compliance and services. The SEAP reviewed the draft SPP/APR at its December 4, 2020, meeting. To help them better understand the dynamics of the numbers, we presented the state trend data as well as comparisons across the nine designated regions of the state. The regional numbers helped the SEAP members better understand the variation that exists from one region to another. Some of the more prominent differences were between regions that are predominantly rural or urban.

No target revisions were proposed as this report uses the final set of annual targets, however baseline year changes were made for Indicators 5 and 6.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	66.70%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%	35.30%
Data	87.50%	80.95%	66.67%	81.82%	64.71%

Targets

FFY	2019
-----	------

Target >=	35.30%
-----------	--------

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
4	6	12	64.71%	35.30%	83.33%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data collection for this indicator was not impacted by COVID-19.

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Dr. Stephen Barr

Title:

Assistant Commissioner

Email:

stephen.barr@dese.mo.gov

Phone:

573-751-4444

Submitted on:

04/29/21 1:44:46 PM